UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/928,925	08/13/2001	Shepherd S.B. Shi	044935.0000/2	8037

7590 05/20/2005	**EXAMINER**
Joseph Chung	BAYARD, DJENANE M
Foxconn International, Inc.	
1650 Memorex Drive	
Santa Clara, CA 95050	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2141	

DATE MAILED: 05/20/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

> A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM
> THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
> - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
>   after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
> - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
> - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
> - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
>   Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
>   earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _03 February 2005_.

2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☒ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) _1-20_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) _1-3 and 5-20_ is/are rejected.

7) ☒ Claim(s) _4_ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a) ☐ All   b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

      1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This is in response to amendment filed on 2/030/05 in which claims 1-20 are pending.

Response to Arguments

2.   As per claims 1 and 8, Applicant argues that the data object and the action are validated

on the server based upon the synchronization request message and business logic defined by a

user of the wireless computing device, corresponding to a domain of the data object. However,

LaRue clearly wherein "the sync client performs a method for sending changes to the sync

engine. Thus, for example if a user used the data application to change the telephone number of

a person for whom data is stored in the dataset, then the sync client will send the new telephone

number to the synch engine for incorporation into the dataset" (See col. 17, lines 33-45).

Furthermore, Applicant argues that the data object and the action are validated on the

server based upon the synchronization request message and business logic defined by the user of

the wireless computing device, corresponding to a domain of the data object. Applicant's t

arguments have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

4.   Claims 1, 2, 5-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S.

Patent No. 6,810,405 to LaRue et al in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,643669 to Novak et al.

a.   As per claim 1, LaRue et al teaches a method of database synchronization between a first

database on a server and a second, corresponding database on a wireless computing device,

comprising the steps of generating on a wireless computing device a synchronization request

message, (The sync client performs a method for sending changes to the sync engine);

transmitting the synchronization request object from the wireless computing device to a server

(See col. 17, lines 49-67); validating the data object and the action on the server based upon the

synchronization request message and business logic, defined by a user of the wireless computing

device, corresponding to a domain of the data object (See and col. 18, lines 1-9) (The sync

engine completes conflict and duplicate resolution); updating a remote data storage on the server

based upon the business logic (See col. 19, lines 65-67 and col. 20, lines 1-10) (the sync engine

enters changes from the sync client); generating a synchronization response message on the

server based on results corresponding to the validating and the updating step; transmitting the

synchronization response message from the server to the mobile computing device (See col. 20,

lines 15-24) (the synch engine sends an action ACK Records object for each change received);

and updating a data storage on the wireless computing device based upon the synchronization

response message (See col. 21, lines 4-39) (The synch client enters the changes received).

However, Larue et al fails to teach wherein the synchronization request message a data object

and an action executed on the data object.

Novak et al teaches a method for optimization of synchronization between a client's

database and a server database. Furthermore, Novak et al teaches wherein the synchronization

request message a data object and an action executed on the data object (See col. 2, lines 51-60).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to incorporate wherein the synchronization request message a data object and an

action executed on the data object as taught by Novak et al in the claimed invention of LaRue et

al in order to minimize the amount of time for the synchronization process to utilize system

resources (See col. 1, lines 51-55).

b.   As per claims 8 and 15, LaRue et al teaches a method of verifying an action taken on a

data object stored on a local data storage of a wireless computing device, comprising the steps

of: generating a synchronization request message on a wireless computing device, (See col. 18,

lines 30-54); transmitting the synchronization request message from the wireless computing

device to a server(See col. 17, lines 49-67); processing the copy of the data object on a remote

data storage on the server based upon business logic corresponding to a domain of the data object

and defined by a user of the wireless computing device (See col. 18, lines 50-65 and col. 19-1-

67) (The Sync engine performs conflict resolution and duplicate resolution before updating its

dataset on the data received from the synch client).However, LaRue et al fails to teach wherein

the synchronization request message includes a copy of a data object on a local data storage, an

action that has been taken on the data object, and an old data object corresponding to the data

object prior to when the action was taken.

Novak et al teaches a method for optimization of synchronization between a client's

database and a server database. Furthermore, Novak et al teaches wherein the synchronization

request message includes a copy of a data object on a local data storage, an action that has been

taken on the data object, and an old data object corresponding to the data object prior to when the

action was taken (See col. 3, lines 57-67 and col. 4, lines 1-11).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to incorporate wherein the synchronization request message includes a copy of a data

object on a local data storage, an action that has been taken on the data object, and an old data

object corresponding to the data object prior to when the action was taken.

c.   As per claims 2, 13 and 19, LaRue et al teaches wherein the wireless computing device is

a personal digital assistant (PDA) (See col. 5, lines 13-15)

d.   As per claim 5, LaRue et al teaches the claimed invention as described above.

Furthermore, LaRue et al teaches wherein the synchronization request message includes an old

data object corresponding to the data object prior to the execution of the action and the validating

step comprises the step of: comparing the old data object to a second data object, in the remote

data storage, corresponding to the data object (See col. 20, lines 24-30).

e.   As per claim 6, LaRue et al teaches the claimed invention as described above.

Furthermore, LaRue et al teaches wherein the synchronization response message includes the

copy of the data object if the old data object does not match the copy of the data object (See col.

21, lines 51-60).

f.   As per claims 7, 12 and 18, LaRue et al teaches the claimed invention as described above.

Furthermore, LaRue et al teaches wherein the synchronization request message includes a first

timestamp corresponding to a time the action was executed on the data object and the validating

step comprises the step of: comparing the first timestamp with a second timestamp on a second

data object, stored in the remote data storage, corresponding to the data object (See col. 3, lines

35-40 and col. 18, lines 30-54).

g.   As per claims 9 and 16, LaRue et al teaches the claimed invention as described above.

Furthermore, LaRue et al teaches generating on the server a synchronization response message

based upon a result of the processing step; transmitting the synchronization response message to

the wireless computing device; and, resetting the data object to the value of the old data object if

the synchronization response message indicates that the processing step was not successful; or

setting a status corresponding to the data object to a value of "updated" if the synchronization

response message indicates that the processing step was successful (See col. 3, lines 42-64).

h.   As per 10, LaRue et al teaches the claimed invention as described above. Furthermore,

LaRue et al teaches the processing step comprising the steps of: validating the copy of the data

object; and, if the validation is successful, updating a second data object, in the data storage of

the server, corresponding to the data object (See col. 19, lines 65-67 and col. 20, lines 1-14).

i.   As per claims 11 and 17, LaRue et al teaches the claimed invention as described above.

Furthermore, LaRue et al teaches wherein the step of: comparing the old data object to the

second data object (See col. 19, lines 16-55).

j.   As per claims 14 and 20, LaRue et al teaches the claimed invention as described above.

Furthermore, LaRue et al teaches wherein the wireless computing device is a computer (See col.

5, lines 13-15).

5.   Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over No. 6,810,405 to

LaRue et al in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,643669 to Novak et al as applied to claims 1, 8 and 15

above, and further in view of U.S. Patent Application No. 2003/0069874 to Hertzog et al.

a.   As per claim 3, LaRue et al in view of Novak teaches the claimed invention as described

above. However, LaRue et al in view of Novak fails to teach prior to the transmission step,

determining whether or not the wireless computing device is in a on-line mode or an off-line

mode; and if the wireless computing device is in a on-line mode, proceeding to the transmitting

the synchronization request message step; or if the wireless computing device is in a off-line

mode, placing the synchronization request message into a synchronization queue; and proceeding

to the transmitting the synchronization request message step once the wireless computing device

is in the on-line mode.

Hertzog et al teaches a method and system to automate the updating of personal information within a personal information management application and to synchronize such updated personal information management information. Furthermore, Hertzog et al teaches prior to the transmission step, determining whether or not the wireless computing device is in a on-line mode or an off-line mode; and if the wireless computing device is in a on-line mode, proceeding to the transmitting the synchronization request message step; or if the wireless computing device is in a off-line mode, placing the synchronization request message into a synchronization queue; and proceeding to the transmitting the synchronization request message step once the wireless computing device is in the on-line mode (See page 4, paragraph [0051] and page 5, paragraph [0057]).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate prior to the transmission step, determining whether or not the wireless computing device is in a on-line mode or an off-line mode; and if the wireless computing device is in a on-line mode, proceeding to the transmitting the synchronization request message step; or if the wireless computing device is in a off-line mode, placing the synchronization request message into a synchronization queue; and proceeding to the transmitting the synchronization request message step once the wireless computing device is in the on-line mode as taught by Hertzog et al in order to detect when the client machine establishes a connection to the network and trigger a global synchronization operation (See page 4, paragraph [0052]).

Allowable Subject Matter

6.   Claim 4 objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be

allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and

any intervening claims.

Conclusion

7.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Djenane M Bayard whose telephone number is (703) 305-6606.

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday- Friday 5:30 AM- 3:00 PM..

        If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Rupal Dharia can be reached on (703) 305-4003. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

        Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Djenane Bayard

Patent Examiner

RUPAL DHARIA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER